

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/936,503	09/13/2001		Robert-Peter Klein	512100-2022	6117	
20999	7590	02/25/2004	EXAMINER			
FROMME	R LAWR	ENCE & HAUG	YOUNG, MICAH PAUL			
, ,,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
1.200 1010				1615		

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u> </u>			T					
	Apr	olication No.	Applicant(s)					
		936,503	KLEIN ET AL.					
Office Action Summa	<i>ry</i> Exa	miner	Art Unit					
		ah-Paul Young	1615					
The MAILING DATE of this co	mmunication appears	on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address					
Period for Reply			(O) 550M					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COM - Extensions of time may be available under the pr after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of the state of the period for reply specified above is less than a lift NO period for reply is specified above, the max failure to reply within the set or extended period Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.7	MUNICATION. ovisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). lis communication. thirty (30) days, a reply within imum statutory period will appl for reply will, by statute, cause months after the mailing date of	In no event, however, may a reply be tir the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day y and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed vs will be considered timely. It the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
1) Responsive to communication	(s) filed on 23 Novem	ber 2003.						
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL .	2b)⊠ This action							
3)☐ Since this application is in con	, —		osecution as to the merits is					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 9-15</u> is/are per	ding in the application	n.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed								
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7 and 9-15</u> is/are reje								
7) Claim(s) is/are objected								
8) Claim(s) are subject to		ction requirement.						
Application Papers								
9)☐ The specification is objected to	by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that ar								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) in								
11)☐ The oath or declaration is obje								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a	claim for foreign prior	ity under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None			, , , ,					
1. Certified copies of the p		e been received.	·					
_ ,	•	e been received in Applicat	ion No					
		ocuments have been receive						
application from the Inte	rnational Bureau (PC	T Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office	e action for a list of the	e certified copies not receive	ed.					
Attachment(s)			· (DTO 442)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Re 	view (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D						
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date			Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 1615

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment of Papers Received: Request for Continued Examination 11/24/03

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 3. Claims 7, 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined disclosures and teachings of Hoffmann (USPN 5,820,876 hereafter 876) in view of Nichols (USPN 4,804,541) and Phillips (USPN 4,732,153 hereafter 153).
- 4. '876 et al teaches a TTS with a backing layer, drug depot, and matrix, which encompasses the drug depot. The TTS further comprises a pressure sensitive adhesive, which adheres to the skin. The drugs and active agents delivered by the TTS ranges from nicotine to sexual hormone like progesterone and thymoleptics like scopolamine (hydrobromide) (col. 3, lin. 23 67; Fig. 1 3; col. col. 5, lin. 24 col. 6, lin. 22). The reference however does not disclose a paper support material for the matrix, however the reference does disclose a fibrous cellulosic material, which suggests the presence of a paper-like substance.

'541 et al teaches a TTS with a backing material impermeable to the active agents. The TTS further comprises a pressure sensitive adhesive component that affixes to the skin and a matrix component that contains the active agents. The matrix material is can be made of

Art Unit: 1615

absorbent paper. The active agent of the invention is the sexual hormone estradiol (col. 2, lin. 15 -29; lin. 57 -65; col. 3, lin. 3 -11). The paper does not disclose a rigidity or weight.

'153 discloses a transdermal device where the matrix is a heavy weight absorbent filter paper (example 1).

With regard to claims 10 - 12, the specific weight of the paper used as a support for the active agent would be determined through routine experimentation by one of ordinary skill in the art. A skilled artisan would be able to determine the optimal weight of paper in order to maximize the absorption of the active agent and the delivery of the agents. Regarding claims 13 and 1, a skilled artisan would be able to modify the amount of the active agent applied to the substrate. It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation. See In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Furthermore the claims differ from the reference by reciting various concentrations of the active ingredient(s). However, the preparation of various transdermal compositions having various amounts of the active is within the level of skill of one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. It has also been held that the mere selection of proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. *See* In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228 169 USPQ 426 (CCPA 1971).

A skilled artisan would be able to follow the suggestions of '876 to include the absorbent paper of '541 in order to provide a proper support for the TTS. The artisan would have seen from '153 that papers could be of heavy weight and absorbent, providing rigidity and an absorbent quality as well. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to substitute the matrix

Art Unit: 1615

of '541 into the structure of '876 in order to improve to improve the transmission of the active agent, specifically estradiol. It would have been obvious to combine these teaching since they both deliver sexual hormones transdermally. It would have been obvious to combine these teachings as such with an expected result of a TTS device with a paper-supported matrix that delivers estradiol.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, the examiner would like to address the remarks regarding the Nichols reference. Applicant argues that the claim limitation "support paper" implies rigidity to the TTS. It is the position of the examiner that "support" does not imply rigidity, yet a description of a component. Support material can be flexible, and absorbent as seen in bandages, and in the '153 reference (example 1). The '153 reference discloses a heavy weight absorbent paper material used in a transdermal device. Further the claims do not exclude that the paper cannot be absorbent, only tat it provides support for the drug depot. Again if rigidity of the TTS is a defining feature of the instant invention, the applicant is invited to include such limitations barring they are properly supported by the specification.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Micah-Paul Young whose telephone number is 571-272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-4:30 every other Monday off.

Art Unit: 1615

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K Page can be reached on 571-272-0602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Micah-Paul Young Examiner Art Unit 1615

MP Young

Gollamudi S. Kishore, PhD Primary Examiner, Group 1600